



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,174	07/15/2003	William Mak	5486-0138PUS1	4990
67321	7590	10/15/2008		
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP				
PO Box 747				
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
LONG, ANDREA NATAE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/619,174

Applicant(s)

MAK ET AL.

Examiner

Andrea N. Long

Art Unit

2176

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 18, 19, 26-29, 31 and 77-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 18, 19, 26-29, 31 and 77-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

FINAL ACTION

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 07/11/2008, Applicant amended claims 15, 31, and 77, cancelled claims 30 and 84, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 04/11/2008.

Based on the cancelling of claims 30 and 84, the rejections of claims 30 and 84 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for those claims previously set forth is withdrawn.

Based on the amendments of claim 77, the rejection of claims 77-81 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for those claims previously set forth is withdrawn.

It is noted that the Applicant has not addressed the issue of claim 31 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, and therefore the rejection is being reproduced below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 31 is directed to "a tangible computer readable medium". According to the specification, page 8 paragraph 31, recites, "communication media typically embodies a modulated data signal, such as a carrier wave". Signals, as a medium is not one of statutory subject matter.

Based upon the cited portion of the Specification, it is unclear whether the “tangible” computer readable medium comprises the data signal/carrier wave. Thus, adding the term “tangible” to the claim language does not overcome the 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 15, 26, 29, 31, 77, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al (Remote Desktop Environments Reflected in Local Desktop Windows, March 1, 1993), hereinafter “Johnson”.

For the convenience of the Applicant, the Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art(s) of record in the body of this action. Although the specified citations are representations of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. The Applicant should consider the entire reference(s) as applicable as to the limitations of the claims.

As to independent claims 15, 31, and 77, Johnson teaches a method comprising:

displaying in a first window on a first display device (page 421 – remote workstation's desktop environment) operatively connected to a control device (page 421 – remote workstation's desktop environment (Local Area Network, “LAN”);

displaying a second window on a second display device separate from the first display device (page 421 - local workstation displaying the remote desktop environment in a local window), the second display device operatively connected to the control device (LAN);

editing content of the second window from within the second window (page 421-425 - users can manipulate remote workstation desktop environments via actions on a local window);

displaying the edited content on the first window (421-425 - actions performed within the remote desktop environment in a local window will be viewed in the remote workstation's desktop environment);

displaying a region on the second display device separate from the second window (page 421 & 423, Figure 2 - local desktop), wherein contents on the region are not displayed on the first display device; and

updating the first window of the first display device by dragging content from the region on the second display device to the second window (page 424 & 425 - taught as a file object be moved or copied from a local workstation to remote workstation by dragging and dropping objects from the local workstation to the remote desktop environment in the local window displayed on the local workstation).

As to dependent claim 26, Johnson teaches dragging content from the second window to the region on the second display device (page 424 & 425 - taught as a file object be moved or copied from a local workstation to remote workstation by dragging and dropping objects from the local workstation to the remote desktop environment in the local window displayed on the local workstation).

As to dependent claims 29 and 83, Johnson teaches wherein contents of the second window are substantially identical to contents of the first window (page 421 - the second window

on the second display device is a remote desktop environment, which is a mirror of the desktop of the remote workstation). It is noted that a subset can be equivalent to a set and therefore can consist of all elements of a set.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, 19, 78, 79 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Sigona et al (5694150), hereinafter "Sigona".

As to dependent claims 18 and 78, Johnson teaches dragging content from the region. While Johnson does not forcefully teach the method of which an electronic pen is used for dragging the object, one skilled in the art can infer that the use of an input device is present in Johnson's teachings. Sigona teaches a pen as a known pointing/input device (column 1 lines 34-37).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of a pen as a user input device to allow ease of dragging and dropping files on a screen and for providing a pointing coordinate.

As to dependent claims 19 and 79, Johnson teaches dragging content from one region to another location. Johnson further teaches actions performed on the remote desktop environment displayed in a window on the local workstation require interpreting to correspond accordingly (page 422). While it is reasonable for one of skill in the art to include mapping of coordinates from one region to a remote region, Johnson however does not forcefully teach wherein the step of dragging comprises determining at least a first coordinate of the second display device and mapping the first coordinate to a corresponding coordinate of the first display device. Sigona teaches determining at least a first coordinate of the second display device and mapping the first coordinate to a corresponding coordinate of the first display device (column 4 lines 58-68, column 9 line 55 through column 10 line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Johnson with the mapping of Sigona to provide a smooth transition of information from one region to a remote location.

As to dependent claim 80, Johnson teaches dragging content from the second window to the region on the second display device (page 424 & 425 – taught as a file object be moved or copied from a local workstation to remote workstation by dragging and dropping objects from the local workstation to the remote desktop environment in the local window displayed on the local workstation).

Claims 27, 28, 81, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Sigona in further view of Herndon et al (6249290 B1), hereinafter “Herndon”.

As to dependent claims 27, 28, 81 and 82, Johnson in view of Sigona teaches the method of claim 18. However Johnson in view of Sigona fails to teach magnifying at least a portion of content in the region on the second display device with said electronic pen and wherein the portion magnified includes information associated with a location of the pointing device with the region. Herndon teaches magnifying at least a portion of content in the region of the second display device using an input device (column 5 lines 1-13 – Herndon teaches zooming in on objects in response to a mouse or keyboard) and wherein the portion magnified includes information associated with a location of the pointing device with the region (column 2 lines 21-29).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Johnson and Sigona with the zooming engine of Herndon to allow users to review available resources from a broad perspective and then focus with greater detail on particular resources.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 07/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that Johnson does not disclose or suggest publicly sharing some windows while keeping other windows private. That is, Johnson does not disclose or suggest a) editing content of the second window from with the second window; b) displaying the edited content on the first window; and c) displaying a region on the second display device separate from the second window, wherein contents on the region are not displayed on the first display device; or d) updating the first window of the first display device by dragging content from the region on the second display device to the second window.

The Examiner disagrees.

Johnson teaches a first window (remote workstations desktop environment), a second window (the remote workstation's desktop environment that is displayed in a local window on an administrator's local workstation) and a region (the administrator's local desktop). Johnson teaches where the administrator actions available include all those available to the remote desktop user and more. Additionally Johnson describes how actions and manipulations taken in either environment will reflect the action or changes in the other environment. The region which is the administrator's local desktop is not viewable by the remote desktop user and therefore can be considered private, while the remote desktop is available to view by the remote desktop user

and the administrator and is therefore public. Johnson teaches an administrator being able to drag objects from the local desktop to the remote desktop via the second window being displayed on the local desktop. Therefore Jonson teaches all of the claimed limitations of the independent claims of the present application.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
October 7, 2008

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176